

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Fig. 5. This sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5. Fig. 5 has been amended to include “Prior Art” label.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent. In this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Adequate descriptive support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found in, for example, Fig. 1 and relevant description of the specification.

II. The Objection to the Drawings

Fig. 5 has been objected to because the figure should be designated by the legend “Prior Art.” It is noted that Applicants already submitted the Preliminary Amendment dated March 30, 2005, to add the legend “Prior Art” to Fig. 5. However, the USPTO’s file does not appear to have amended Fig. 5, Applicants resubmit amended Fig. 5 in this Amendment. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

III. The Objection to the Specification

The abstract has also been objected to because according to the Examiner, the last sentence “A speaker module mentioned above not only emits sound but also improves in design” refers to the purported merits of the invention and also is not grammatically correct. In response, the abstract has been amended to address the Examiner’s concern. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

IV. The Rejection of Claims 1-6

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto. The Examiner asserted that Matsumoto discloses a speaker system identically corresponding to what is claimed.

In response, Applicants submit that Matsumoto does not disclose a speaker module including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, Matsumoto does not disclose, at minimum, a first diaphragm having a first face and a second face opposing the first face, and a hermetic space formed by a panel and first and second diaphragms facing the second face, as recited by claim 1.

Matsumoto discloses a typical passive radiator and a lamp disposed in a speaker box. The structure of the speaker box reflects sound generated on a front face of a speaker to the outside effectively, and sound generated on a rear face of the speaker is emitted to the outside after being amplified in the bass by the passive radiator. Thus, the front face of the speaker emits middle to high pitch sounds and the rear face of the speaker emits low pitch sound. This structure is a typical passive radiator.

On the other hand, a speaker module of the claimed invention emits all regions of sounds at the front face (second face). Sounds emitted from the rear face (first face) are not used. In addition, the sounds from the front face (second face) are emitted from the second diaphragm via air in the hermetic space, while Matsumoto's speaker emits sound to the outside directly.

Accordingly, Matsumoto does not identically disclose a speaker module including all the limitations recited in independent claim 1 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102. Dependent claims 2-6 are also patentably distinguishable over Matsumoto at least because these claims include all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully

solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and favorable consideration thereof.

V. The Rejection of Claim 7

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Atsushi (correctly “Unno”) (Japanese Patent Application No. 11-270713 (Publication No. 2001-95074)).

Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over Matsumoto and Atsushi at least because it includes all the limitations recited in independent claim 1. Similar to Matsumoto, Atsushi does not teach, at a minimum, a first diaphragm having a first face and a second face opposing the first face, and a hermetic space formed by a panel and first and second diaphragms facing the second face, as recited by claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and favorable consideration thereof.

VI. The Rejection of Claim 8

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Atsushi (correctly “Unno”) (Japanese Patent Application No. 10-52174 (Publication No. H11-252671)).

In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner admitted that Matsumoto does not teach a device comprising a main unit, “wherein the speaker module is installed into the main unit, supplied with electricity from the main unit to the light emitting section, and emit light...,” recited in claim 8. However, the Examiner asserted that Atsushi teaches the missing features of

Matsumoto, and concluded that it would have been obvious to modify Matsumoto based on the teachings of Atsushi to arrive at the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the applied combination of Matsumoto and Atsushi does not disclose a device including all the limitations recited in claim 8. Specifically, Matsumoto does not teach, at a minimum, “a light emitting section for emitting light to the panel, wherein the panel transmits the light from the light emitting section to a side of the second diaphragm,” as recited by claim 8.

The Examiner asserted that Fig. 1 showing lamp 6 discloses the above-cited limitation of claim 8. Matsumoto’s lamp illuminates illumination plate 5, but does not emit light to panel 1. It is apparent that panel 1 does not transmit the light from lamp 6 to illumination plate 5, in contrast to what is claimed in claim 8.

Atsushi does not cure the above deficiencies of Matsumoto. Atsushi in Fig. 7, for example, illustrates that light from LEDs is transmitted through second light diffusion transparent panel 21 to first light diffusion transparent panel 10. However, second light diffusion transparent panel 21 is different from the claimed panel in that the claimed panel forms the hermetic space with diaphragms, whereas panel 21 does not.

Accordingly, the applied combination of Matsumoto and Atsushi does not teach a device including all the limitations as recited by claim 8 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103 and favorable consideration thereof.

VII. Conclusion

It should, therefore, be apparent that the imposed rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for immediate allowance. Favorable consideration is, therefore, respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TT
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 27, 2006

WDC99 1263088-1.043890.0732



3/4

FIG. 5
PRIOR ART

